

Christopher B. Ghio (State Bar No. 259094)  
Christopher Celentino (State Bar No. 131688)  
Yosina M. Lissebeck (State Bar No. 201654)

**DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP**

655 West Broadway, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101

Telephone: 619.400.0500

Facsimile: 619.400.0501

christopher.ghio@dinsmore.com

christopher.celentino@dinsmore.com

yosina.lissebeck@dinsmore.com

Tyler Powell (Ky. Bar No. 90520 – Admitted pro hac vice)

Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

100 West Main Street, Suite 900

Lexington, KY 40507

Telephone: 859-425-1056

Facsimile: 859-425-1099

tyler.powell@dinsmore.com

Special Counsel to Richard A. Marshack, Chapter 11 Trustee

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**

**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SANTA ANA DIVISION**

In re:

THE LITIGATION PRACTICE GROUP P.C.,

Debtor.

RICHARD A. MARSHACK,  
Chapter 11 Trustee,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARASH ASANTE BAYROOTI, a California  
resident

Defendant.

Case No.: 8:23-bk-10571-SC

Adv. Proc. No. 8:24-ap-1068-SC

Chapter 11

**TRUSTEE'S FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

**(1) AVOIDANCE, RECOVERY, AND  
PRESERVATION OF FRAUDULENT  
TRANSFER(S);**

**(2) AVOIDANCE, RECOVERY, AND  
PRESERVATION OF 4-YEAR  
CONSTRUCTIVE VOIDABLE  
TRANSFERS; AND/OR**

**(3) AVOIDANCE, RECOVERY, AND  
PRESERVATION OF PREFERENTIAL  
TRANSFER(S);**

For his *Complaint for (1) Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfer(s); (2) Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfer(s); and/or (3) Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Preferential Transfer(s)* (the “Complaint”), plaintiff Richard A. Marshack, the Chapter 11 Trustee (the “Trustee” or “Plaintiff”) for the bankruptcy estate (the “Estate”) of debtor The Litigation Practice Group P.C. (the “Debtor” or “LPG”) in the above-captioned bankruptcy case (the “Bankruptcy Case”), alleges and avers as follows:

**STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION, NATURE OF PROCEEDING, AND VENUE**

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(b)(2)(A), (E), (H) and (O), 1334(b), and General Order No. 13-05 of the District Court for the Central District of California because this is a core proceeding arising in and/or related to the Bankruptcy Case, which is a case under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”), and which is pending in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California, Santa Ana Division (the “Court”).

2. Regardless of whether this proceeding is core, non-core, or otherwise, the Plaintiff consents to the entry of a final order and judgment by the Bankruptcy Court.

3. Defendant is hereby notified that Rule 7008 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure requires him to plead whether consent is given to the entry of a final order and judgment by the bankruptcy court.

4. Venue of this adversary proceeding properly lies in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1409(a) because this proceeding is related to the Debtor’s pending Bankruptcy Case.

**THE PARTIES**

5. Debtor LPG is, and at all material times was, a professional corporation organized, existing, and in good standing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in Tustin, California.

6. Defendant Arash Asante Bayrooti (“Mr. Bayrooti”) is, and at all material times was, an individual resident of the state of California subject to service of process at 23 Costa Del Sol, Dana Point, CA 92629-4039.

///

**GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

**A. The Bankruptcy Case**

7. On March 20, 2023 ("Petition Date"), Debtor filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, commencing the Bankruptcy Case.

8. The Office of the United States Trustee ("UST") filed its *Motion by United States Trustee to Dismiss or Convert Case Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)* [Bankr. Docket No. 21] and creditors Debt Validation Fund II, LLC; MC DVI Fund 1, LLC; and MC DVI Fund 2, LLC filed the *Motion by DVF and MC DVI to Dismiss Chapter 11 Case Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105, 305, 349, & 1112, or in the Alternative Convert This Case to Chapter 7 or Appoint a Trustee* [Bankr. Docket No. 44]. On May 4, 2023, the Court entered its *Order Directing United States Trustee to Appoint Chapter 11 Trustee* [Bankr. Docket No. 58].

9. Pursuant to the *Acceptance of Appointment as Chapter 11 Trustee* [Bankr. Docket No. 63], on May 8, 2023, Trustee accepted his appointment as the Chapter 11 Trustee in the Bankruptcy Case, and he continues to serve in this capacity at this time. The Court approved the Trustee's appointment in its *Order Approving the U.S. Trustee's Application for the Appointment of a Chapter 11 Trustee* [Docket No. 65].

10. Trustee was not appointed until after events of the case and, therefore, bases these allegations on information and belief. *Soo Park v. Thompson*, 851 F.3d 910, 928 (9th Cir. 2017) ("The *Twombly* plausibility standard . . . does not prevent a plaintiff from pleading facts alleged upon information and belief where the facts are peculiarly within the possession and control of the defendant or where the belief is based on factual information that makes the inference of culpability plausible."); *Miller v. City of Los Angeles*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 198871, 2014 WL 12610195, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2014) (recognizing that the plaintiffs' "information and belief" pleading was allowed and "necessary at times"); *see also Mireskandari v. Daily Mail and General Trust PLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 194437, 2013 WL 12129642, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2013) ("The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allow parties to plead facts on 'information and belief' if the facts 'will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.'" (citations omitted)).

1 11. Plaintiff brings this action solely in his capacity as the Chapter 11 Trustee for the  
2 benefit of Debtor's Estate and its creditors.

3 **B. LPG**

4 12. LPG operated a law firm for consumers across the country who sought assistance in  
5 contesting or resolving debts they would identify.

6 13. The consumers would pay LPG over a period of time via monthly debits from their  
7 bank accounts.

8 14. The monthly payments were meant to cover all legal services LPG provided to the  
9 consumers including validation of the debts, review of documents to determine enforceability, and  
10 court appearances to halt lawsuits to obtain judgments.

11 15. In certain instances, LPG would file a lawsuit in an effort to eliminate a disputed debt  
12 or to prosecute affirmative claims held by the consumers.

13 **DETAILS OF SPECIFIC TRANSACTION**

14 16. Upon information and belief, Mr. Bayrooti was a prior owner of forty-six (46) shares  
15 ("Stock") in B.A.T., Inc. dba Coast Processing ("Coast"). Upon information and belief based on the  
16 affidavits of Russ Squires and Darius Newbold filed in state court litigation against the Debtor, Coast  
17 was the entity that LPG used to run its marketing and client development operations.

18 17. Due to his ownership interest in Coast and Coast's relationship with LPG, Mr. Bayrooti  
19 was a regular presence in the offices of LPG. Employees treated Mr. Bayrooti as a *de facto* owner or  
20 officer of LPG who directed the work of LPG employees.

21 18. On or about June 10, 2021, Tony Diab, another shareholder in Coast, executed a Stock  
22 Purchase Agreement ("Agreement") with Mr. Bayrooti to document the terms of Mr. Diab's purchase  
23 of Mr. Bayrooti's Stock. A true and accurate copy of the Agreement without exhibits is attached  
24 hereto as **Exhibit A**.

25 19. The Agreement's stated purchase price for the Stock was \$7,130,000.00 to be paid in a  
26 lump sum amount of \$3,680,000.00 at closing followed by monthly payments thereafter until the  
27 purchase price was paid in full. Mr. Diab executed a promissory note and accompanying security  
28 agreement (collectively "Note") to document the amount remaining owed under the Agreement. A

1 true and accurate copy of this Note is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

2 20. While the consideration was to be paid over time, Mr. Bayrooti delivered the Stock in  
3 Coast to Mr. Diab at closing upon the delivery of a lump sum payment.

4 21. Despite the Agreement being between Mr. Bayrooti and Mr. Diab, the Agreement  
5 required that LPG guaranty Mr. Diab's obligations to Mr. Bayrooti under the Agreement in a separate  
6 agreement ("Guaranty"). A true and accurate copy of this Guaranty is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

7 22. Upon information and belief, the Agreement was modified to reduce the initial lump  
8 sum payment from \$3,680,000.00 to \$2,000,000.00 with the remaining \$5,130,000.00 to be paid in  
9 installments thereafter. An addendum to the Agreement documenting this change may have been  
10 drafted, but the Trustee does not know if this addendum was ever executed

11 23. Upon further information and belief, the parties performed under the Agreement on or  
12 about June 10, 2021, with Mr. Bayrooti delivering the Stock to Mr. Diab and Mr. Bayrooti receiving  
13 the reduced lump sum payment of \$2,000,000.00.

14 24. Following the closing under the Agreement, Mr. Diab failed to make the payments that  
15 he promised to make in the Agreement, as modified or amended.

16 25. On September 6, 2022, LPG received a wire transfer from Sunflower Bank in the  
17 amount of \$6,244,811.78 that was deposited in its checking account at Union Bank ending in X4874  
18 ("Account"). PurchaseCo 80, LLC ("PurchaseCo") sent this wire as a partial payment for its alleged  
19 purchase of the future income from approximately 10,000 client files of LPG. This payment is the  
20 subject of another adversary proceeding in this case (Adv. No. 8:23-ap-01098), and the Trustee  
21 reserves all his rights regarding the treatment and characterization of the transaction with PurchaseCo.

22 26. On September 7, 2022, the end of day balance of the Account was \$5,846,242.36.

23 27. On or about September 8, 2022, LPG paid \$5,814,146.45 ("Payment") to Mr. Bayrooti  
24 via Check No. 0216 drawn on the Account. A true and accurate copy of the Check (with redactions  
25 of confidential information) is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

26 28. The end of day balance of the Account on September 8, 2022 was \$32,095.91. A  
27 redacted copy of the September 2022 statement from the Account is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

28 29. While the Account was designated as an IOLTA account at the bank, the Debtor did

1 not treat the Account as a trust account and comingled its own funds with other deposits in the  
2 Account.

3 30. Upon information and belief the amount of the Payment was the sum of the  
4 \$5,130,000.00 owed to Mr. Bayrooti under the Agreement plus another \$684,146.50 that was added  
5 for payment of late fees and/or interest.

6 31. In early September 2023 and prior to Payment being made, LPG's financial condition  
7 was dire and continuing to deteriorate. LPG had been sued numerous times in New York state court  
8 by merchant cash advance lenders and was constantly refinancing or restructuring existing debts to  
9 avoid default.

10 32. As discussed above, the funds for the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti came from LPG  
11 promising to pay its future income from approximately 10,000 client files to PurchaseCo in exchange  
12 for the amount wired into the Account and other consideration.

13 33. While LPG told PurchaseCo that the future receivables from these client files were free  
14 and clear of liens, claims, and encumbrances, this was false.

15 34. LPG had already promised to pay a substantial percentage of funds it received from  
16 consumer clients to the marketing affiliates that had initially referred those consumers to LPG. While  
17 the terms of these fee sharing agreements varied, LPG often promised to pay marketing affiliates  
18 between forty and sixty percent of the payments it received on referred matters.

19 35. Prior to the transaction with PurchaseCo and the subsequent Payment, LPG had also  
20 previously granted security interests on all its assets to numerous lenders who had perfected these  
21 security interests in filings with the California Secretary of State.

22 36. As a result of these transactions, LPG had already sold or promised to pay more than  
23 100% of its income to multiple parties before it had paid operating expenses.

24 37. Furthermore, as alleged by Debt Validation Fund II, LLC and related entities in their  
25 Orange County Superior Court<sup>1</sup> suit against LPG, on September 1, 2022 LPG entered into Note  
26 Exchange and Restructuring Agreements and Secured Promissory Notes to restructure approximately  
27 \$70 million dollars in existing debt. According to this complaint, LPG obligated itself to pay Debt

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Case No. 30-2023-01303355-CU-CO-CXC in the Superior Court for Orange County California.

1 Validation Fund II, LLC and related entities more than \$110 million dollars upon execution of these  
2 restructuring agreements.

3  
4 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

5 **COUNT I**

6 **(Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers**  
7 **To or In Favor Of Mr. Bayrooti [11 U.S.C. §§ 548, 550, and 551]**

8 38. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs as if fully re-alleged herein.

9 39. LPG received nothing in exchange for executing the Guaranty in favor of Mr. Bayrooti  
10 to secure repayment of the Note of Mr. Diab, who was neither an owner nor officer of LPG.

11 40. Upon information and belief, LPG was insolvent when Mr. Diab caused it to execute  
12 the Guaranty in June 2021 and when the Payment was made as its debts exceeded the fair market value  
13 of its assets at all relevant times.

14 41. In June 2021, LPG had not only promised to pay a portion of its income from numerous  
15 client files to the marketing entities that referred those files to LPG, but it was also indebted to more  
16 than six different merchant cash advance lenders.

17 42. By June 10, 2021, there were eight UCC-1 statements of record filed with the California  
18 Secretary of State against LPG.

19 43. By June 28, 2021, two of these lenders (Ace Funding Group and Ein Cap, Inc.)  
20 (collectively “Pre-Petition Creditors”) that had filed UCC-1 statements had sued LPG in Kings County  
21 Superior Court Case No. 515748/2021 and 515835/2021 in New York state claiming that LPG had  
22 defaulted under agreements with them.

23 44. Because LPG’s execution of the Guaranty was a fraudulent conveyance subject to  
24 avoidance, LPG received no benefit or value when it made the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti to satisfy its  
25 obligation under the Guaranty.

26 45. When LPG made the Payment in September 2022, its financial condition was worse  
27 than it was in June 2021 when it executed the Guaranty. LPG had just restructured the debts it owed  
28 to Venture Partners by promising to pay millions of additional dollars to Venture Partners in the future.

1 Also, numerous lawsuits filed by creditors were pending against LPG when the Payment was made.

2 46. LPG obtained the funds used to make the Payment by promising to pay PurchaseCo  
3 the future income from almost 10,000 of its own client files. This transaction further deepened the  
4 insolvency of LPG for the benefit of Mr. Bayrooti.

5 47. Accordingly, the execution of the Guaranty and the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti should be  
6 avoided as fraudulent transfers under 11 U.S.C. § 548(a)(1)(B), and the Payment should be recovered  
7 and preserved for the benefit of the Estate pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 550 and 551.

8 **COUNT II**

9 **(Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Voidable Transfers**  
10 **Against Defendant)**  
11 **[11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551; CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 3439.05, and 3439.07]**

12 48. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates here by reference each and every allegation  
13 contained in paragraphs 1 through 47 as though set forth in full.

14 49. The execution of the Guaranty and delivery of the Payment occurred within the four  
15 years prior to the Petition Date.

16 50. The execution of the Guaranty and delivery of the Payment happened while Debtor:

- 17 a. was insolvent or became insolvent as a result;
- 18 b. was engaged or was about to engage in a transaction for which any property remaining  
19 with Debtor was of unreasonably small capital; or
- 20 c. intended to incur, or believed that it would incur, debts beyond its ability to pay as such  
21 debts matured.

22 51. Upon information and belief, LPG was insolvent when Mr. Diab caused it to execute  
23 the Guaranty in June 2021 and when the Payment was made as its debts exceeded the fair market value  
24 of its assets at all relevant times.

25 52. LPG received nothing in exchange for executing the Guaranty in favor of Mr. Bayrooti  
26 to secure repayment of the Note of Mr. Diab, who was neither an owner nor officer of LPG.

27 53. Because LPG's execution of the Guaranty was a voidable conveyance subject to  
28 avoidance, LPG received no benefit or value when it made the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti to satisfy its  
obligation under the Guaranty.



54. The execution of the Guaranty and the delivery of the Payment are voidable conveyances pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 544(b) and CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 3439.05 and 3439.07 by one or more creditors who held and hold unsecured claims against Debtor that were and are allowable against his Estate under 11 U.S.C. § 502 or that were not and are not allowable only under 11 U.S.C. § 502(e), including, without limitation, the Prepetition Creditors.

55. Accordingly, the execution of the Guaranty and the Payment should be voided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b) and CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 3439.05 and 3439.07, and such transferred property, or the value thereof, should be recovered and preserved for the benefit of the Estate pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 550 and 551 and CAL. CIV. CODE § 3439.07.

### COUNT III

## Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Preferential Transfers From Mr. Bayrooti [11 U.S.C. §§ 547, 550, and 551]

56. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates here by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 55 as though set forth in full.

57. In the alternative, if the execution of the Guaranty and Payment are not determined to be fraudulent conveyances, the Payment can still be recovered from Mr. Bayrooti as a preferential transfer paid to an insider within one year of the petition date.

58. Prior to the execution of the Agreement, Mr. Bayrooti was a stockholder in Coast, which worked closely with LPG. Indeed, Coast used the ‘doing business as’ name of LPG in many instances.

59. Upon information and belief, Mr. Bayrooti acted as an officer or manager of LPG and gave directions to employees as if he was an officer/manager of LPG.

60. As a *de facto* officer/director of LPG, Mr. Bayrooti was an insider of LPG as that term is defined in 11 U.S.C. § 101(31)(B).

61. If the Guaranty is determined to be a valid obligation of LPG, the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti satisfied its obligations under the Guaranty, and the Payment was made to or for the benefit of Mr. Bayrooti – a creditor under the Guaranty.

62. If the Guaranty is determined to be a valid obligation of LPG, then the Payment made

1 to satisfy LPG's obligations under the Guaranty was a payment on an antecedent debt within the  
2 meaning of 11 U.S.C. § 547(b)(2).

3 63. Upon information and belief, the Debtor was insolvent when the Payment was made  
4 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 547(b)(3). The Debtor's insolvency at this time is evidenced by large debts  
5 owed to numerous creditors, its many promises to pay substantial portions of its future income to  
6 numerous third parties, and by numerous, pending lawsuits filed against LPG claiming default under  
7 numerous agreements.

8 64. The Payment was made to or for the benefit of an insider within the one year period  
9 preceding the Petition Date and can be recovered pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 547(b)(4).

10 65. As a result of the Payment, Mr. Bayrooti became entitled to recover more than he  
11 would have received if: (i) the Debtor's case was under chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code; (ii) the  
12 Payment had not been made; and (iii) Mr. Bayrooti had received payments of his debts under the  
13 provisions of the Bankruptcy Code. As evidenced by the Debtor's schedules filed in the underlying  
14 Bankruptcy Case, as well as the proofs of claim that have been received to date, the Debtor's liabilities  
15 exceed its assets to the point that unsecured creditors will not receive a full payout of their claims from  
16 the Debtor's bankruptcy estate.

17 66. Pursuant to the foregoing, the Payment is avoidable pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 547(b).

18 67. Accordingly, the Payment should be avoided as a preferential transfer to an insider  
19 under 11 U.S.C. § 547(b), and the Payment should be recovered and preserved for the benefit of the  
20 Estate pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 550 and 551.

21 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant judgment in his favor and  
22 against the Defendant:

23 A. Finding both that the execution of the Guarantee and the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti were  
24 fraudulent conveyances subject to avoidance and preservation pursuant to §§ 548(a)(1)(A) or (B) and  
25 550;

26 B. Finding both that the execution of the Guarantee and the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti  
27 were voidable conveyances subject to avoidance and preservation pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b),  
28 550, and 551; CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 3439.05, and 3439.07; and/or

1 C. If the Guaranty is determined to be a valid obligation of LPG that cannot be avoided  
2 as requested above, Plaintiff asks the Court to find that Mr. Bayrooti was a non-statutory insider of  
3 LPG as the term insider is defined by 11 U.S.C. § 101(31) and that

4 D. the Payment to Mr. Bayrooti was a preferential transfer made between ninety days and  
5 one year before the petition date of LPG that is subject to avoidance and preservation pursuant to §§  
6 547(b) and 550:

7 E. Awarding pre-judgment interest at the maximum legal rate running from the date of the  
8 Complaint to the date of judgment herein;

9 F. Awarding post-judgment interest at the maximum legal rate running from the date of  
10 judgment herein until the date the judgment is paid in full, plus costs;

11 G. Requiring Mr. Bayrooti to pay forthwith any judgment awarded herein; and

12 H. Granting Plaintiff such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

13  
14 Dated: July 12, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

15 DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

16 By: /s/ Tyler Powell

17 Christopher B. Ghio

18 Tyler Powell

19 Christopher Celentino

20 Special Counsel to

21 Richard A. Marshack